





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

Lord Russell's Statements on the Irish (h: Revenue) Exam ^d	1
Speeches during the Election of 1865 by W. E. Gladstone	2
Americanisation. By an old Whig	3
The Irish Church. By Rev A. T. Lee	4
Speeches on Parliamentary Reform in 1866. By John Bright	5
The Conscience Clause. By John Oakley	6
The Conscience Clause. By Archd ^l . Denison	7
The Conscience Clause. By Rev J. Gregory Smith	8
The Conscience Clause in 1866. By J. G. Hubbard & Rev G. Trevelyan	9
Compulsory Education. By Rev D. Coleridge	10
School Rates in England & America. By Archd ^l . Sinclair	11
On the present Educational Crisis. By Archd ^l Grant	12
The present state of the Ch: in Ireland. By Rev A. T. Lee	13
Probable course of legislation on Popular Education. By Canon McNeill	14

Handwritten text, likely a letter or document, written in a cursive script. The text is heavily faded and illegible due to the quality of the scan. It appears to be a single page of writing, possibly a letter, given the structure and flow of the script. The text is written in dark ink on a light-colored paper.

John G. Talbot

THE STATEMENTS
OF
EARL RUSSELL, K.G.,
RESPECTING THE
REVENUES OF THE IRISH CHURCH,
IN THE NEW EDITION OF HIS ESSAY ON
"THE ENGLISH GOVERNMENT & CONSTITUTION."

EXAMINED BY
AN ENGLISHMAN RESIDENT IN IRELAND.

"Decipimur specie recti."

HORACE.

"Truth is to be sought only by slow and painful progress. Error is in its nature flippant and compendious; it hops with airy and fastidious levity over proofs and arguments, and perches upon assertion, which it calls conclusion."

J. P. CURRAN.

LONDON: J. H. & JAS. PARKER, 377, STRAND.
DUBLIN: HODGES & SMITH, 104, GRAFTON STREET.

1865.

W. AND G. BAIRD,
PRINTERS AND BOOKBINDERS,
ARTHUR STREET, BELFAST.

REMARKS, &c.

WHEN a Cabinet Minister, who, for a long period, has taken a prominent part in the administration of the affairs of the country, and has held the highest offices in the State, gives to the world a new edition of an elaborate work on the British Constitution, to which subject he has for many years directed his special attention, that work will naturally at first be received by the public with that respect which is due to the position of its author, and with that confidence in the fidelity of its statements and the accuracy of its details, which, in general, so distinguishes the publications of British Statesmen.

When, moreover, such a Minister, in the Preface to the revised edition of his work, tells us that in preparing it "he was struck with the vast difference which exists between the state of affairs in 1823, and their present condition," and that, therefore, he had determined in an Introduction "to explain the great changes which the last forty years have brought forth," and to supply "a few notes pointing out the difference of the times," we have a right to expect that when great changes have taken place

since the date of the original publication of the work, on any subject of which it treats, these changes will be briefly pointed out in the notes, and the reader referred to other sources of information from which he may ascertain the true state of the case at the present time. If this is not done, the original statement in the text will be taken to represent the true state of affairs at the time of the republication of the book, and will be received as of unquestionable authority by those who have confidence in the veracity and honour of its author.

But if, in addition, a question arises which is of great public interest, and involves matters which belong to the very foundations of our Constitution, and which have often of late been discussed in Parliament, and concerning which, therefore, accurate information is eagerly sought, then the statements of such a Minister, on such a question, republished at such a time, will be received by the public in general as of the greatest weight, and will unhesitatingly be referred to by those who repose confidence in him, as containing a true and accurate account of the question.

If, moreover, this question should be one, concerning which misstatements would be especially injurious to those affected by them; if the mind of the Legislature, as well as that of the public, is likely to be influenced by the view which one so distinguished as a statesman would take of the subject, then it

would become his imperative duty, in republishing it to the world, to weigh well every word he had written, and to guard carefully against exaggerated statements, or overcolouring in detail.

But if unmindful of these duties, if apparently careless alike of the effect his misstatements may produce, or the injury they may inflict, such a statesman should reproduce exaggerations the most monstrous, and assertions for the truth of which not even a shadow of proof can be given, then we should justly consider that such an author had forfeited all right to our confidence, all claim to our respect when considering this matter.

Such is the position which it seems to us Earl Russell now occupies with regard to the Irish Church question.

We will first give Lord Russell's remarks respecting the Irish Church in full, and then proceed to examine their accuracy and truthfulness in detail.

Having, at page 306, comforted the heart of the self-denying Lord Westbury, by assuring him that "the Lord Chancellor receives a splendid income of £20,000 a year," just twice his official salary—and having a few lines further on added ten to the number of English Deaneries in the gift of the Crown, and some £10,000 per annum to several English Bishoprics, and thus prepared us in some measure for the exaggerations which are to follow, Lord Russell thus proceeds : —

“The Church in Ireland is still more richly endowed. There are in Ireland four Archbishops and eighteen Bishops, whose united income is estimated at £185,700 a-year. The Bishop of Derry has £15,000 a-year, the Bishop of Elphin has £12,000, the Bishop of Raphoe £10,000, and none are under £4,000 a-year. But besides this acknowledged income, the revenues of the Irish Bishops, drawn from fines, is enormous; their landed property is immense; leases are for 27 years; and fines are taken every seven, or even every three years, thus becoming a kind of triennial rents. Mr. Wakefield calculated that the Estates of the following Sees would, if fairly let, bring the following sums:—The Primacy of Armagh, £140,000 a-year; the See of Derry, £120,000; the See of Kilmore, £100,000; the See of Clogher, £100,000; the See of Waterford, £70,000. The patronage is extremely valuable. In the Bishopric of Cloyne, one living is worth £3,000 a-year, one £2,000, one £1,800, and six from £1,500 to £1,200; the whole of the livings in the gift of the Bishop of Cloyne are valued at £50,000 a-year. There are about 1,300 benefices in Ireland, upwards of 200 of which are in the gift of the Crown.”*

We will deal first with the income of the Archbishops and Bishops, whose gross and net income is

* Essay on the English Government and Constitution, pages 307, 308.

in every case given below.* Earl Russell tells us there are four Archbishops and eighteen Bishoprics in Ireland, whose united income is £185,700 a-year, and no note or intimation is added that this is not the number and income of the Irish Bishops at the present day.† The truth is, there are two Archbishops and ten Bishops in Ireland, whose total net income, according to a Parliamentary return, supplied by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, is £55,100 per annum,‡ or, deducting agents' fees and poundage, £51,110.§

* The following is taken from Capt. Stacpoole's return, No. 287, p. 82 :—

	Gross.	Net.
Armagh,	£15,758	£8,328
Meath,	4,308	3,664
Tuam,	5,265	4,038
Down and Connor, ..	4,988	3,524
Derry,	13,628	5,939
Kilmore,	6,851	5,246
Dublin,	8,249	6,569
Ferns, &c.,	4,630	3,867
Cashel, &c.,	5,190	4,402
Limerick, &c., ..	4,612	3,961
Killaloe, &c., ..	3,880	3,261
Cork, &c.,	2,697	2,304
Total,	£80,059	£55,100

+ Lord Russell, indeed, thinks it necessary to note (page 209) that an improved Latin Grammar has been agreed upon by the masters of our public schools in 1864, and is careful to add that the statements made in page 299, respecting the Civil List, apply only "to the period 1821-23;" but when he comes to page 306-308, he repeats the whole of the exaggerations respecting the Irish Church, and gives no intimation to the reader that they are not perfectly and entirely correct at the present day.

† See Captain Stacpoole's return, page 82.

§ See Archbishop of Armagh's charge in 1864, page 7.

No less than £134,590 is thus added by Lord Russell to the yearly income of the Irish Bishops. Even Lord Althorp, when making out the best case he could for spoliation against the Irish Church in 1833, only estimated the annual income of the then Bishops at £130,000 a-year, but Lord Russell, who sat in that Parliament for South Devon, and who was at the time a member of the Cabinet, and had therefore every opportunity of becoming acquainted with the true state of the case, has added £55,700 a-year (a sum larger than the present income of all the Irish Bishops) to the statement of Lord Althorp; and, not content with his original blunder, declares "that besides this acknowledged income, the revenue of the Irish Bishops, drawn from fines, is enormous—their landed property is immense."

It is difficult to know how to deal with a sentence such as this. The statements it contains are so entirely contrary to the real facts of the case, that it seems an inadequate reply to say they are simply untrue. Lord Russell speaks of the lands attached to the Bishoprics, as if they were still the property of the Bishops, and he values the tenants' perpetuities as if they still belonged to the See. He might as well say that the enormous income now derived by the noble house of Russell from lands once the property of the Church, and on which Russell Square, Woburn Square, and other valuable properties now stand, forms at present a part of the

annual income of the See of London ! The fact is the Irish Bishops only enjoy the moderate incomes mentioned above. They cannot enrich themselves or their families from the property of the See, for they are restrained by statute from doing so. The whole case is so well put by the Archbishop of Armagh in his late Charge to his Clergy, that we cannot do better than quote His Grace's own words — "It is true," says the Archbishop, "that the landed properties attached to the Bishop's Sees are extensive, and it is not unusual to hear them spoken of as if they were all in the possession of the Bishops. This, I need hardly say, is not the case. They only receive from their Sees the moderate income I have stated. The Episcopal lands are let on leases of twenty-one years, at a very small reserved rent, and an annual renewal fine of one-fifth of the profit rent. The other four-fifths are and have been enjoyed by the See tenants for many generations. It has been erroneously supposed, and of late asserted, that the Bishops in Ireland are in the habit of enriching their families by leasing to them the See lands on the favourable terms I have mentioned. This is simply impossible, the lands being all in the hands of the tenants who held them by *lease*. If in some rare instances the tenant declines to renew, and suffers the lease to expire, the Bishop cannot lease them again on the same advantageous terms, for he is restrained by statute. The

terms on which he may re-lease the lands give to the See three-fifths of the rent (including renewal), and to the Bishop's lessee, two-fifths. But this is a loss not a gain to the Bishop, as the lease does not in any degree equal the value of the twenty-one years' fines, which must have been lost before the land thus came into his possession. If the families of Bishops wish to become possessed of leases of See lands, they must purchase them as other persons do." (Charge of 1864, pages 7 and 8.)

It is very evident, then, that "the income the Irish Bishops draw from fines is *not* enormous," neither is "their landed property immense."

Let us now proceed to consider Lord Russell's second statement with regard to the income of the Irish Bishops. He tells us that the Bishop of Derry has £15,000 a-year, the Bishop of Elphin £12,000, the Bishop of Raphoe £10,000 ; and none are under £4,000 a-year. Here his lordship has condescended to enter into particulars ; it would have been better for his own reputation had he confined himself to general statements. We are told that there is a Bishop of Elphin, with £12,000 a-year, and a Bishop of Raphoe, with £10,000. Will it be credited that neither of these Bishoprics have at present *any revenue whatever* ? That there is no Bishop of Raphoe, and no Bishop of Elphin ! That in 1841, Elphin was united to Kilmore, and in 1834 (more than thirty years ago), Raphoe was united to Derry ;

and the revenues of the annexed Sees assigned, as each vacancy occurred, to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Moreover, these Sees, even previous to the Church Temporalities Act, never had the annual income Lord Russell assigns to them. The *gross* value of the Bishopric of Elphin was £7,034, and of Raphoe, £5,787, total £12,821 per annum.* Lord Russell tells us it was £22,000 per annum; whereas, at the present time, the net annual income of the united Bishoprics of Kilmore, Ardagh, and Elphin, is only £5,246 17s, and that of the united Bishoprics of Derry and Raphoe, £5,939 3s; and these two Bishoprics are by far the wealthiest in Ireland.† So that whilst, according to Lord Russell's statement, the Bishops of Derry, Raphoe, and Elphin enjoy an annual income of £37,000 a-year, the truth is that the Bishoprics of Raphoe and Elphin are suspended, and their incomes transferred to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners; whilst the Bishop of Derry has under £6,000 a-year. Here, then, Lord Russell is in error £31,000 a-year.

A graver delinquency than that of which Lord Russell has thus been guilty, could scarcely have been committed by a public man and a Cabinet Minister. He has, deliberately repeated, and endorsed with the sanction of his authority, which, both at home and abroad, from his present position

* Parliamentary Return, No. 762, 1833.

† Captain Stacpoole's Return, page 82.

and previous political career, must necessarily be great, uncalled for and exaggerated statements, which a very moderate amount of industry and research would have enabled him entirely to avoid.*

What, then, becomes of the vast estates of the United Diocese of Armagh and Clogher, which Lord Russell tells us are fairly worth £240,000 a-year; or of Derry, which he estimates at £120,000; or of Kilmore, at £100,000 a-year? They have vanished into thin air. They do not exist. They never did exist, save in the fruitful brain of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, or of the unreliable authorities on whom he depends for his information.

*Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatu?
Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.*

But we have not yet exhausted Lord Russell's catalogue of Irish Church abuses. "The patronage," he tells us, "is extremely valuable. In the Bishopric of Cloyne, one living is worth £3,000 a-year, one £2,000, one £1,800, and six from £1,500 to £1,000. The whole of the livings in the gift of the Bishop of Cloyne are valued at £50,000 a-year."

We have been at the pains to examine carefully into this statement, and, fortunately, a return lately

* It will be seen from the Return of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, No. 267, page 82, that the net value of the Bishopric of Cloyne (now Cork, Cloyne, and Ross) is only £2,304 a-year; and that the net income of six of the ten Irish Bishops is under £4,000 a-year.

made to Parliament enables us to do so with accuracy. Lord Russell says there are *nine* livings in the Diocese of Cloyne whose value ranges from £3,000 to £1,000 a-year. *The truth is there is not a single living in the Diocese of Cloyne whose net value exceeds £1,000 a-year.* The living of greatest value is that of Garrycloyne, the net income of which is £806 a-year. The next in value is Donaghmore, with £661 a-year; the next is Brigone, with £601, and *all the other livings in the Diocese* are under £600 a-year. Several are of very small value: Killenemore is £29 a-year, and Lackeen is £23.* So that on investigation, we find that instead of nine fat livings of over £1,000 a-year, with an aggregate value of between £14,000 to £15,000, as Lord Russell would have us believe, there is no single living in the Diocese of Cloyne of the value of £1,000 a-year. All the livings in the Diocese except one being under £800 a-year net.

There is still one more point to examine, and that is Lord Russell's account of the patronage of the Bishop of Cloyne. That bishopric, on the death of Bishop Brinkley in 1835, was annexed to the see of Cork, and is now held in conjunction with it. Twelve of the livings in the diocese of

* These pages were in the press when the Lectures of the Right Hon. James Whiteside, M.P., on the Church in Ireland were published. An accurate examination of Lord Russell's statements will be found in a note at page 154-155 of that valuable book.

Cloyne are in the gift of the Crown, and these by no means the least valuable; two are in the gift of the Dean and Chapter; and several are in lay patronage. The total net value of *all* the livings in the Diocese, is £24,385 a-year; and yet Lord Russell tells us that “the whole of the livings in the *gift of the Bishop* are valued at £50,000 a-year.” No comment is needed on such a statement as this: it speaks for itself.

From the mis-statements introduced into the body of his book, let us now turn to Lord Russell’s remarks on the Irish Church, in the Introduction to his work. We there find a reference made to the celebrated Appropriation Clause of 1835, a measure which, he tells us, would have “granted a portion of the Church Revenues of Ireland to purposes of Education;” but which being “unpopular in England was not carried in the House of Lords.”* But Lord Russell does not tell us that the Appropriation Clause proposed to deal alone with the surplus that might remain *after the spiritual wants of the Churchmen of Ireland had been duly provided for*. Reckoning, as Lord Russell reckons, with that wonderful facility he possesses of multiplying a Bishop’s income from nothing to £12,000 a-year, a large surplus no doubt would be found for such purposes. But reckoning as sober men are accustomed to

* Introduction, page lxx.

reckon, from the facts of the case, or even reckoning as Mr. Justice Shee would have us do, it will be found that the whole income of the Irish Church is not sufficient to meet the admitted and reasonable requirements of the Irish Bishops and Clergy; and that, in many dioceses, those wants have to be supplied by grants from the Additional Curates' Society, — the income of the Incumbents not permitting them to keep a Curate themselves,— and yet, such being the real facts of the case, Lord Russell in the Introduction to this work, written in 1865, does not hesitate to say, that “when England shall examine this question dispassionately, it may be expected, that although the State will not entangle itself with the support of a Roman Catholic Clergy, as Mr. Pitt projected, *the whole people* of Ireland will be allowed to derive some benefit from so large a revenue. National Education, and public improvement of various kinds, might receive at least a portion of the revenue raised from the land for the benefit of the people.”* We know not what pittance Lord Russell would think sufficient for the support of the Irish Clergy. They are gentlemen. They have, with very few exceptions, all received a University education. Many of them have large families to support. They are as faithful and devoted as any body of Clergy in the world in the discharge of the duties of their sacred calling. This

* Introduction, page lxxi.

is allowed, their enemies themselves being judges,* and they receive on an average the enormous income of £245 a year,† which, if taken *entirely* from the Church, and divided equally amongst the people of Ireland, would give each of them about 16d a head per annum. Truly great would be the benefit the Irish people would derive from such a wise measure, and it is hard to say what a large amount of tranquillity and contentment would thence ensue! It is evident that a great impulse would be given to the cause of education, and it would require the unerring foresight and accurate calculation of a member of the house of Russell to estimate the amount of “public improvements of various kinds” that would accrue thereby.

We are almost tempted to believe that Lord Russell, in an unhappy moment for his own reputation, with the unsuspecting confidence of parental affection, handed over the revision of that portion of his work which treats of the Irish Church to his eldest son, Lord Amberley; who, with unbounded belief in the accuracy of his father’s statements, gave vent to the

* “My belief is, that as far as abuses, in the common sense of the word, are concerned—that is, those which depend on the conduct of the Bishops and Clergy, and which are remediable by the wisdom and energy of the clerical body, or the purity of life of its lay members—it is my belief that the Irish Church is perfectly free from such abuses. We must all accord to that Church this praise: that her Clergy are a body of zealous and devoted ministers, who give themselves to their sacerdotal functions in a degree not inferior to those of any Christian Church.”—*Speech of Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, March 28th, 1865.*

† See Primate’s Charge of 1864, page 10.

indignation which they had engendered in his mind, when, in his memorable, but feeble speech at Leeds, he declared that "Bishops in Ireland are superfluous luxuries."

In conclusion, what are we to say, what to think of statements such as these? Lord Russell is a leading member of the present Government; he is Her Majesty's Minister for Foreign Affairs; we must suppose therefore that he has much weight in the councils of the Cabinet, and occasionally, at least, by his influence sways its decisions. As one who, during the whole of his Parliamentary career, has paid the greatest attention to the working of the British Constitution, and has taken a leading part in all the great changes of the last thirty-five years, who, for six years has been Prime Minister of England, and has thus become intimately acquainted with the whole system of constitutional government in this country, his opinion on any important subject will doubtless at first be received by his colleagues, and by the public, both at home and abroad, with that confidence in his statements which his position would seem to merit. But if, on further examination, it is found that his statements on any particular question are neither founded on fact, nor will for a moment, bear the test of searching inquiry; then their confidence will be turned into distrust, their belief into doubt, their admiration into deserved reproach. If the despatches which, during the last few years, have issued from

the Foreign Office, have been dictated by a spirit similar to that in which Lord Russell has treated the Irish Church question, can we wonder that our relations with nearly every Foreign Government are at present anything but satisfactory?*

* Our readers will pardon us for re-producing here the Rev. Sydney Smith's estimate of Lord Russell's character, contained in his second letter to Archdeacon Singleton, pages 41, 42, and published by Longman in 1838, now twenty-seven years ago. We fear that length of days has not brought to Lord Russell, when dealing with Church affairs, an increase of wisdom. "Lord John Russell gives himself great credit for not having confiscated Church property, but merely re-modelled and re-divided it. I accuse that excellent man, not of plunder, but I accuse him of taking the Church of England, rolling it about as a cook does a piece of dough with a rolling-pin, cutting a hundred different shapes with all the plastic fertility of a confectioner, and without the most distant suspicion that he can even be wrong, or ever be mistaken; with a certainty that he can anticipate the consequences of every possible change in human affairs. There is not a more honest, nor a better man in England than Lord John Russell; but his worst failure is, that he is utterly ignorant of all moral fear—there is nothing he would not undertake. I believe he would perform the operation for the stone—build St. Peter's—or assume (with or without ten minutes' notice) the command of the Channel Fleet; and no one would discover from his manner that the patient had died—the Church had tumbled down—and the Channel Fleet been knocked to atoms. I am sure his motives are always pure, and his measures often very able; but they are endless, and never done with that pedetentous pace and pedetentous mind in which it behoves the wise and virtuous improver to walk. He alarms the wise Liberals; and it is impossible to sleep soundly while he is in command of the watch."†

"Do not say, my dear Lord John, that I am too severe upon you. A thousand years have scarce sufficed to make our blessed England what it is—an hour may lay it in the dust; and can you, with all your talents, renovate its shattered splendour? Can you recal back its virtues? Can you vanquish time and fate? But alas! you want to shake the world, and be the Thunderer of the scene."

+ "Another peculiarity of the Russells is, that they never alter their opinions; they are an excellent race, but they must be reprimanded before they can be convinced."

Lord Russell, then, we fear, must be considered guilty of having given the sanction of his authority, which, from his position, both as a minister and statesman, is undoubtedly great, to mis-statements the most exaggerated, and to mis-apprehensions the most palpable. His faults are both of omission and commission. He has neglected to correct his old errors of many years standing, and he has added others which the most moderate care on his part might have prevented his falling into, and this, too, when the Irish Church question is confessedly one of the greatest importance at the time, and intimately connected with the Constitution of the country.

But the errors of Lord Russell will not be without a salutary effect, if Englishmen will learn from them this much needed lesson: Let them not permit themselves in future to be misled by the statements of those who are adverse to the Irish Church, however exalted their station, however eloquent and plausible these statements may be. No, not even if they are Chancellors of the Exchequer, or former Prime Ministers of England. Let them no longer be content to believe the current, but most erroneous, ideas that are abroad on this subject, but let them carefully and dispassionately EXAMINE THE FACTS OF THE CASE FOR THEMSELVES. The more they do this, the more we are convinced will existing prejudices disappear, gradually the clouds of mis-statement and exaggeration which, for many

years, have gathered around the Irish Church question, will be cleared away, and the Irish Church be recognised by the great mass of thinking Englishmen as being—what indeed she is—the great bulwark of religious freedom and constitutional liberty in Ireland.

NOTE.

AN amusing instance of the wide-spread evil arising from mis-statements such as those we have been considering, appeared in an article of the *Times*, on June 7th, 1865 ; no doubt Earl Russell read it on that morning with the utmost satisfaction, and not without much regret at the sad ignorance which prevails on the Continent respecting English affairs, not for a moment considering that, in all probability, it was his own book on the British Constitution which had led the too confiding Frenchman astray. We venture, therefore, to think that, in this case, we may apply to Lord Russell the well-known words of the poet of old—

“ Quid rides ? mutato nomine *de te*
Fabula narratur.”

“The necessity of going from home to hear news is often obviated by foreigners coming to us to tell it. Some benevolent stranger, with the best possible wishes for our welfare, remonstrates with us on the absurdities of our political life, points out the anomalies of our social system, and calls upon us to correct these glaring errors. Much, however, to our loss, these good intentions are too commonly coupled with imperfect knowledge, and with insular rudeness we are disposed to laugh at such critics as the excellent M. ASSOLANT and his *confrères*. We have now before us a wonderful example of the serene self-confidence with which a French-

man can demonstrate the errors of his neighbours. It appears that there exists, and, little as we knew it, for some months has existed, among us a French periodical, supported by a numerous staff, presided over by a "directeur-gérant," assisted by a "secrétaire de la rédaction." A dull placidity has of late reigned over the world, and the "directeur-gérant" has been at his wits' end for materials to fill up his sheet. In his despair he has had recourse to that excellent stock subject the Irish Church, and the Frenchmen in England, and those Englishmen who may chance to meet with this journal, have been favoured with some very remarkable facts on the state of the Irish Establishment. The unfortunate writer has, however, vague notions of past and present. He is a RIVAN WINKLE who has slept for a generation, and is ignorant of what has happened while he slept. The worst abuses of forty years since are described as if they still existed, and the narrative of our contemporary is about as trustworthy as an account of France under CHARLES X. would be when applied to the France of the Third NAPOLEON.

No one among us can desire to ignore the anomalous character of the Irish Church. It is the onerous inheritance bequeathed to us by our forefathers. If the members of the House of Commons were privately examined, it would probably be found that there is not one-tenth of them which does not regret that the Irishmen of two centuries ago were not as vigorous and united as Scotchmen in resisting the imposition of a religious establishment repugnant to their wishes. But they were disunited then, as they always are, and we are cursed by the success of our ancestors. The difficulty is before us, and it is not very easily managed. If it has not been more vigorously dealt with, it is because no one knows what would be carried away by the *momentum* of its downfall. Our French friend, however, is unaware that anything has been done. He tells his readers, with admirable good faith, that there are twenty-two Irish Archbishops and

Bishops, in happy ignorance of the measure which at one swoop reduced the Protestant Episcopacy of the sister isle to a dozen. The twenty-two among them, he goes on to say, hold one-nineteenth of the land of Ireland. Their average income is £10,000 per annum. They are backed up by Deans and Canons, who enjoy revenues of proportionate magnitude. One Dean has £4,000 a-year; another is obliged to be content with £3,700; a Chancellor has £2,400, and a Precentor receives the moderate income of £2,350. This wonderful Establishment is supported by the iniquitous exaction of tithes, and where these are insufficient, ministers' money is demanded to satisfy the rapacity of the Protestant clergy. We almost feel regret in knocking over these startling assertions. The abuse as stated is so grand, its figures are so magnificent, that the vitality of a nation which could endure it must be enormous; *but, unfortunately, these figures were never absolutely true, and they have long since ceased to be even an approximation to the truth.* Tithes are abolished, and the Bishops have been reduced in number. The incomes of prelates and cathedral dignitaries are largely diminished, and an Ecclesiastical Commission at Dublin is charged with the collection of their former revenues, part of which has been diverted to secular purposes. The men of this generation are too weak to support an abuse which their predecessors upheld with a tenacity it can only admire. The Reformed Parliament has done something, we may say a great deal, and is at this moment hesitating as to what shall be done next, when down comes "M. le directeur-gérant" to arraign us for our supineness in leaving things as they were forty years since."



